



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/565,092	04/05/2007	Shitong Yang	291903-1010	9035
24504	7590	03/11/2008	EXAMINER	
THOMAS, KAYDEN, HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, LLP			NGUYEN, TAI V	
600 GALLERIA PARKWAY, S.E.				
STE 1500			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
ATLANTA, GA 30339-5994			3729	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/11/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/565,092	YANG ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	TAI NGUYEN	3729	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 January 2006.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-4 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
- Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim 3 is objected to because of the following informalities:

In claim 3, the term “enamelled” (line 2) should be change to -- enameled --.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kurogi et al (US 5,396,696) in view of Nuttall et al (US 4,743,331) and further in view of Yang (US 6,737,603).

As applied to claims 1 and 2, Kurogi et al disclose an apparatus for producing an electronic inductor comprising a coil winder (e.g. 75), a locator of inductor, and a spot electric welder (e.g. 41, 42), the locator of inductor being located under a welding head (e.g. 4) of the spot electric welder and a jig (e.g. 44) of the welding head.

Kurigi et al does not teach that an inductor connecting with a brushless DC motor via a connecting pole, the brushless DC motor connecting a single chip and a digital display screen.

Nuttal et al discloses that a locator can be connected with a brushless DC motor (e.g. 17) via a connecting pole, the brushless DC motor connecting (see Fig. 2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at this time the invention was made to have modified the method of Kurogi by including DC motor, as taught by Nuttall et al, to positively provide spin welding together on opposed surfaces of thermoplastics components (col. 1, lines 34-36).

Yang, teaches a digital display screen (e.g. 48).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at this time the invention was made to have modified the method of Kurogi by utilizing process as taught by Yang, to provide a display having a sampling slide-wire resistance with a function converter to adjusting device of the weld force (col. 2, lines 10-12).

As applied to claim 3, Yang teach the spot electric welder is a welder that can weld enameled wires directly (col. 3, lines 52-59).

As applied to claim 4, Yang discloses a camera CCD (e.g. 5) is added to the front of the apparatus (see fig. 1).

Conclusion

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to TAI NGUYEN whose telephone number is (571)272-4567. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (7:30 A.M - 4:30 P.M).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Peter Vo can be reached on 571-272-4690. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/A. Dexter Tugbang/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3729

TN. February 20, 2008